



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,601	02/15/2002	Pengfei Wu	1823430.00121US1	1545
23483	7590	09/10/2008		
WILMERHALE/BOSTON			EXAMINER	
60 STATE STREET			ANGEBRANDT, MARTIN J	
BOSTON, MA 02109				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/10/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com  
teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com  
sharon.mathews@wilmerhale.com

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/077,601

**Applicant(s)**

WU ET AL.

**Examiner**

Martin J. Angebrannt

**Art Unit**

1795

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Martin J. Angebrannt.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Monica Grewal (40056).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 September 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: the independent claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Natanson and Wu.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Martin J. Angebrannt/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135, (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

As a generality, the larger the difference between the temperature and the  $T_g$  of the polymer, the greater the freezing out of the motion of the dispersed azobenzenes (Natansohn, Azo containing polymers: digital and Holographic storage", at pages 2 and 11.

The Wu et al. Phys. Rev. B paper shows for MY-PMMA and EO-PVA the gratings are transient. If the composition used in the instant invention is the same as that used in the Wu et al. paper, including the  $T_g$  of the resultant compositions, The inventive process could be characterized as producing an unobvious result as using the claimed process as a stable grating is formed, rather than the transient grating produced in the process of Wu et al.. This result is unobvious for the temperature difference between the  $T_g$  of the composition and the temperature at which the gratings are stable for an extended period. (prepub describes 12 hours at [0035]). The result of the Wu et al. paper would not extend beyond this due to the general teachings in the art relating to higher  $T_g$ s freezing out motion (see also prepub at [0024]), such as that discussed above and in the previous office actions. The applicant may choose to submit a signed declaration executed by one of the inventors who has first hand knowledge (and hopefully evidence) discussing the materials of the Wu et al. paper and those used in the inventive process and if these are the same materials including the  $T_g$  of the resultant compositions. The process claim 49 would have to be amended to be co-extensive with this showing, perhaps by reciting the  $T_g$  of 85 degrees or the temperature range below the  $T_g$  at which the motion is frozen out. The applicant should point specifically where any language added to the claims can be found in the specification as filed so as not to risk denial of entry on NEW MATTER grounds. It is not clear to the examiner if process claim 59 could be made allowable as this relates to the readout, not the inventive recording.

Currently the claims use "comprising" language which leaves them open to the presence of other beams, such as the readout beam in Wu et al. or the additional illumination from the opposite side with a second blue beam as in figure 10. The examiner notes that Jager et al. does not seem to have a separate readout beam apparently uses the self-diffraction of one of the beams for readout and forms a stable RELIEF grating, which is not observed in Wu et al. (see Jager at pages 1776-1777). This is due to the use of polymer bound/pendant azo chromophores, rather than azo chromophores dispersed (not bound) in a polymer (see also Natansohn at page 11). The system/apparatus claims would not be allowable.

/Martin J Angebrannt/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795